UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/791,269 | 03/03/2004 | Hyun-Jei Chung | SDIYPL.386AUS | 8941 |
| 20995 7590 06/02/2011 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | HODGE, ROBERT W | |
| FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1729 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/02/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com efiling@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/791,269 | CHUNG ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet | with the correspondence address |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| THE REPLY FILED <u>23 May 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITIC | N FOR ALLOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendme application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in cofor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must periods: | nt, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ompliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the da no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | n the mailing date of the final rejection. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correspondi under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period fo set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ing amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee or reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41 Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set fAMENDMENTS | I.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of fili (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by matter | n (see NOTE below); |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of | of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a non-allowable claim(s). | separate, timely filed amendment canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.8 and 19. | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why t was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but p entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections ur showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier pres | nder appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a sented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the clair REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | ms after entry is below or attached. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the ap See Continuation Sheet. | plication in condition for allowance because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s 13. Other: | s) |
| /Robert Hodge Primary Examin | e/ ner, Art Unit 1729 |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: By incorporating the limitations of claim 2 into independent claim 1, applicants have changed the scope of claims 1, 8 and 19 which does not place the application in better form for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants generally refer to figure 1 and paragraphs [0038]-[0044] for supposed support for the limitations in question in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Then refer to 32d and 32e for supposed support for the interior and exterior surfaces, however the specification defines 32d and 32e as upper and lower sealing surfaces respectively but does not define one to be interior or exterior. Nowhere can an "outer edge" be found in said disclosure and there is still no support for a plurality of bent portions or the other terms in question. With regards to Jeong applicants state that the Examiner does not define which wall is the outer wall and then state that the electrode tabs of Jeong are not parallel to the outer wall but are supposedly perpendicular. It is noted that "the outer wall" to which applicants refer is not defined by the instant claims. With regards to the rejection of Nakamura and AAPA, applicants argue the references separately and not the combination as provided in the grounds of rejection.